# COMMANDERS DIGEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE • WASHINGTON, D.C.

Vol. 8, No. 27 October 3, 1970

# Comptroller Discusses Scope Of Changes In Defense Spending

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird views with concern the decline in the Federal budget and is making every effort to assure that the level of resources does not drop below that necessary to assure the security of the Nation.

Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) Robert C. Moot reviewed Secretary Laird's concern during a briefing of the National Security Industrial Association Sept. 24.

Mr. Moot discussed the depth and scope of the changes in Defense spending—both actual and projected.

*Following are excerpts from Mr. Moot's presentation:*

**Peacetime Force Erosion Problem:** Over the past six years, resources applied to peacetime forces of the Department of Defense have been reduced significantly.

The reduction in resources was reallocated to offset partially the escalating cost of the war from 1965 to 1968. The extent of this erosion of resources for peacetime forces amounts to $6 billion at an annual rate and cumulatively from Fiscal Year 1964 exceeds $35 billion.

On a comparable basis (constant 1964

(Continued On Page Two)

# Improvement Is Seen In Military Stature

A high-level management team from the Department of Defense met at Airlie House, Warrenton, Va., in mid-September to discuss problem areas which face the Defense Department today and find solutions, if possible.

Although Defense problems were on top of the agenda, the group also found time to talk about successes in certain areas: the Vietnamization Program—particularly the military aspects—and an improved military stature within the United States.

Explaining the successes as far as military acceptance is concerned, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird said, "The military was under continuing attack for some decisions that they had no part in, but they were continually criticized in the decision-making process."

He said, however, that in the last 18 months the direction of that stature has been changed.

"This is a very important thing for us

(Continued On Page Eight)

**REPORT TO CONGRESS—Retired Air Force Colonel Frank Borman appears before a joint session of Congress to report on his visit to 14 countries as President Nixon's Special Representative on Prisoners of War. In background is Speaker of the House of Representatives John W. McCormack. The text of Col. Borman's address begins on Page Four.**

## Ceremony Marks Voters Day

# *Members Of Armed Forces Urged To Vote In General Elections*

As General Election time draws near, Department of Defense officials are encouraging members of the Armed Forces to cast their votes by using the Federal Post Card Application for Absentee Ballot.

At a Pentagon Courtyard ceremony Sept. 25, marking Armed Forces Voters Day, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird said, "This ceremony marks the opening of our campaign to impress on all military personnel the value of the precious right that is theirs to select public officials and influence public policy."

Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs Roger T. Kelley stated, "Though laws vary, in every State today the military man and his dependents are permitted to vote by absentee ballot. In almost every State, they are permitted absentee registration. Thus the means for full participation in the electoral process are available to the Armed Forces."

He told the audience, "You can be assured that the Secretary of Defense gives his full support in our effort to provide every

(Continued On Page Three)

# Comptroller Discusses Scope Of Changes In Defense Spending

(Continued From Page One)

dollars) the Fiscal Year 1971 resource level for peacetime forces of $44.8 billion is the lowest allocation of Federal budget dollars for such purposes since the 1950-51 period. The same pattern is true for military manpower with the total number for peacetime forces in Fiscal Year 1971 being the lowest comparable total since the 1950-51 period.

**U.S. Foreign Policy** is guided by the Nixon Doctrine. This significant new doctrine, while honoring current U.S. world commitments, transfers greater responsibility for self protection to our allies, particularly in the case of military manpower. The Nixon Doctrine allows for a smaller standing U.S. Army and provides for greater reliance on military assistance to allies in the form of equipment and training support. . . . The Vietnamization Program, which transfers combat and support responsibility from U.S. to Republic of Vietnam forces in an orderly manner, is itself a prime example of the Nixon Doctrine in practice.

**Procurement Trends:** Total Defense outlays for procurement in constant dollars declined from 1954 to 1961 from just under $20 billion to $13.5 billion, increased to $17 billion in 1963, declined to $15.3 billion in 1964, then rose to a Vietnam peak of about $21 billion in 1968-69, and is forecast to decline to just over $15 billion in 1971.

Assistant Secretary of Defense Moot

**Research, Development, Test & Evaluation:** RDT&E funds held fairly constant at just under $3 billion through Fiscal Year 1969, held between $6-$7 billion between 1961 to 1968 and have fallen to slightly less than $6 billion for 1970-71. Over-all fluctuation in the past ten years has not been especially significant.

**Force Modernization:** Forty-seven per cent of the Navy's ships are 20 years old or older. At the end of Fiscal Year 1971, after a heavy program of ship deactivation, the figure will still be 40 per cent.

The purchase of just over 370 aircraft for the Air Force this year compares with more than 945 in Fiscal Year 1969. The aircraft buy for this year is the lowest since the days of the Army Air Corps in 1935.

As of June 1971, the Army will be down to 13⅔ divisions—fewer than at any time since 1960.

**Domestic Priorities Problem:** Critics blame Defense spending for inflation and all other domestic economic ills, but these critics never use any data except that which is applicable to Defense spending. We never hear speeches which use comparable data covering spending in the public sector for other than Defense programs.

**Public Spending:** From 1964 to the 1971 budget year . . . Defense spending shows a cumulative increase of $116 billion. It is to this amount that critics of Defense point when they blame Defense for inflation, for deficits and for other economic problems. These same critics do not point out that in the same period, other public spending increased $442 billion. They do not say that Defense spending accounted for only 20 per cent of the increased public spending and could only be blamed, therefore, for a small proportionate share of the country's economic ills.

**Defense and The National Economy:** If Congress appropriates all of the funds Defense is requesting this Fiscal Year . . . then the annual rate of contract awards will drop 45 per cent from the 1968-69 peak. Only 19 per cent of this cut has been experienced to date. Industrial employment related to Defense will decrease 1.1 million persons from the peak 1968-69 level. Some 1.9 million total military, civil service and industry employes will be seeking new work or different lines of pursuit. The decline will continue into Fiscal Year 1972 if only because requirements of the Vietnam conflict will be less in the next year.

## The Domestic Priorities Problem

(BILLIONS OF DOLLARS)

| | Military | Other Federal | State and Local | Total Government |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Public Spending FY 1964 | $ 50.8 | $ 67.8 | $ 55.3 | $173.9 |
| | | $123.1 | | |
| Cumulative Increase FY 1964 to FY 1971 | 116.0 | 175.0 | 267.0 | 558.0 |
| | | 442.0 | | |
| Public Spending FY 1971 | 71.8 | 129.0 | 115.8 | 316.6 |
| | | 244.8 | | |
| Average Annual Change In Spending— Past Three Years | $ – 2.1 | $ + 22.9 | | $ 20.8 |

## The Peacetime Force Erosion Problem

(BILLIONS OF DOLLARS)

| | TOTAL OUTLAYS |
|---|---|
| • CURRENT BUDGET LEVEL FY 1971 | $71.8 |
| • FY 1971 FUNDS (IN 1964 $) | $53.8 |
| • LESS: INCREMENTAL COST OF WAR; ANNUAL RATE END OF FY '71 ($11 BILLION, '71 $) IN '64 $ | $ 9.0 |
| • FUNDS FOR PEACETIME FORCES FY 1971 (IN 1964 $) | $44.8 |
| • ACTUAL DEFENSE OUTLAYS FY 1964 | $50.8 |
| • EROSION OF PEACETIME FORCE FUNDS | $ 6.0 |

## A Peacetime Force Fund Comparison Constant

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| FY 1971 | $44.8 | FY 1958 | $46.5 |
| 1964 | 50.8 | 1956 | 46.2 |
| 1962 | 51.3 | 1954 | 58.6 |
| 1960 | 46.4 | 1952 | 57.1 |
| | | 1950 | 18.4 |

# Civil Rights Office Name Is Changed To Equal Opportunity

The Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Civil Rights) has been redesignated as the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Equal Opportunity), headed by Mr. Frank W. Render II.

The Department of Defense's Sept. 24 announcement said that Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) Roger T. Kelley directed that the change be effective immediately.

In addition to Mr. Render's title change, three other key personnel assumed Director for Equal Opportunity positions, with specific areas of responsibility. They are: Mr. L. Howard Bennett, Military; Mr. Stuart Broad, Civilian; and Mr. Charles F. Kane, Off-base Housing.

The Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Equal Opportunity) is responsible for assuring that military and civilian service in DoD is a model of equal opportunity for all regardless of race, creed, sex or national origin.

# *Members Of Armed Forces Urged To Vote In General Elections*

(Continued From Page One)

Service person away from home the opportunity to vote."

**Following is Secretary Laird's statement:**

I am proud of what the Department of Defense has done to inform members of the Armed Forces about absentee voting and to encourage them to cast their ballots.

Today the privilege of voting is often taken for granted by those in the military. It seems quite natural that a man or woman, called upon to defend the freedom of others around the world, would be given this fundamental political freedom at home.

### Right To Vote

Effective recognition of the right of Service personnel to vote, however, was late in coming. Less than 20 years ago, one State had a constitutional provision prohibiting voting by members of the regular military establishment. Most other States either did not have provisions for absentee voting by military personnel, or complicated the process to the point of impossibility.

Two figures show how far we have come in this field. In 1942, fewer than 10 per cent of those of voting age in the Armed Forces actually voted, compared to 46 per cent in 1968. In the last election, then, nearly half of all eligible military members voted. The progress since World War II indicates the increased importance military personnel put on voting. It is a tribute to the Department of Defense for its efforts to increase voting participation by its members. That half of the eligibles did not vote in the 1968 election indicates that there is still work to be done.

We have come a long way toward full participation by the Armed Forces in elections, but a significant number of eligible military personnel needs to be informed on the importance of voting, and on the mechanics of the process of casting an absentee ballot. This ceremony marks the climax of our campaign to impress on all military personnel the value of the precious right that is theirs to select public officials and influence public policy.

**As President Nixon told me in a letter last November:**

*". . . I wholeheartedly support your efforts to encourage all the members of the Armed Forces and their dependents to cast their votes not only as a privilege, but also as an obligation."*

I wish to add my own encouragement to every eligible member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to vote this fall.

## Reports To Congress On 14-Nation Tour

# Col. Borman Finds 'Sympathy Around The World' For PWs, Relates 'Feelings' Of A Prisoner, Pleas For Concern

*In an address before a joint session of Congress Sept. 22, Frank Borman, former astronaut and a retired Air Force colonel, made a dramatic plea for the people of this Nation to devote more concern to the plight of American prisoners of war held in Southeast Asia.*

*As President Nixon's Special Representative on Prisoners of War, Col. Borman had completed a 25-day mission around the world, visiting 14 countries, seeking relief for American prisoners of war held by Hanoi and the Viet Cong. He suggested to Members of Congress that they should mobilize world opinion in favor of the prisoners. The situation today, he emphasized, is one of "American anguish and human tragedy." Col. Borman was accompanied by Air Force Colonel Milton K. Kegley.*

*Following is the text of Col. Borman's address:*

I have recently returned from a 25-day trip around the globe in furtherance of the cause of our prisoners of war, and I must tell you that I can only report American anguish and human tragedy.

It is very difficult to discuss the plight of the prisoners of any war without discussing the war itself, but I propose not to do that today, for two reasons:

First, it is quite obvious to any serious student of the intercourse of nations that our course in Southeast Asia cannot be influenced in any significant manner by the treatment or the cause of the prisoners. In other words, we cannot permit them to be political hostages.

Second, I think that the length of the incarceration of many of the men and certainly the conditions of imprisonment of all the men make the humanitarian aspect of this question a transcendent one, and it is certainly one that all Americans can unite behind, regardless of their opinion of the Vietnamese war.

I would ask you to undergo a little exercise that I found helpful on the trip as I tried to renew my faith every evening after a frustrating day. I tried to place myself mentally in the position of a prisoner in a North Vietnamese prison camp, and if you will indulge me for just a few moments, I would like you to place yourselves in that position just briefly, and as you formulate some of the questions and consider your surroundings, allow me to anticipate, if I may, a few of the things that you may be interested in.

First of all, I think you would be amazed to find that a great many of your fellow countrymen, in Government and out of Government, in the Congress, in the States, and even in the Armed Forces, are surprised to find that the Geneva Conventions on the Treatment of Prisoners of War apply to you.

I would like to read, if I may, from Article 2 of this convention.

*The present Convention shall apply to all cases of declared war or of any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the High Contracting Parties . . .*

There is no question that the Geneva Conventions do apply to our prisoners in North Vietnam and in the other areas of Southeast Asia.

### War Criminal Charges

The next question that I am sure you must be considering, particularly if you have been there any length of time at all, is the question of war criminal charges that have been so blatantly and absurdly broadcast by the North Vietnamese and have indeed been rebroadcast and transmitted by many dissident groups within this country. I am told by many fellow returnees that this is one you are greeted with every morning.

I suppose particularly if you are a pilot—and most of you who are incarcerated in North Vietnam are pilots—you would find this a rather difficult charge to comprehend, because I am sure that many of you remember that as a result of a conscious policy of our Government to limit the destruction in North Vietnam to military targets, you were oftentimes forced to fly specified routes over the heaviest antiaircraft concentrations in history. You were specifically ordered and desperately attempted to hit only military targets, and at times it seemed that even basic tactics, local tactics, were being sent from Washington in an effort to ascertain that you did not hit anything but the specified military targets.

I submit to you that the war criminal charge is utter rubbish

**COMMANDERS DIGEST**

**THIS PUBLICATION CONTAINS OFFICIAL INFORMATION, NEWS AND POLICY, DIRECT FROM WASHINGTON AUTHORIZED SOURCES.**

**Editor: John C. Becher**

**Published weekly by American Forces Press Service, 1117 N. 19th St., Arlington, Va. 22200, a unified activity of the Office of Information for the Armed Forces, OASD (M&RA). Reproduction of content is authorized. Suggested dateline for materials used is WASHINGTON (AFPS).**

Wives of prisoners of war, and military and civilian officials listen to Col. Borman during his address to a joint session of Congress on his observations concerning the plight of American servicemen who are PWs or missing in action.

and would not stand up in any reasonable court in any country in the world.

Next, I am sure that one of the questions that you would have is how many of your fellow countrymen share your fate. I have to report to you that I, unfortunately, cannot answer, because the North Vietnamese have never issued a formal and official list of any of their prisoners. Think about that, in the over six years that they held our prisoners, never once have they issued a formal list of the people that they hold, another obvious violation of the Geneva Conventions.

## 1,500 U.S. Citizens Missing

I could tell you that there are about 1,500 U.S. citizens missing in Southeast Asia. We have received letters from 323 prisoners in North Vietnam, and one held by the Viet Cong in South Vietnam. From propaganda broadcasts, pictures, and returnees, we have reason to believe that there are about 376 Americans incarcerated in North Vietnam, 78 in South Vietnam, and three in Laos, making a total of 457 that we know were at one time alive out of the 1,500 that are missing.

I would also have to report to you that some of your fellow prisoners have been held longer than any other prisoners in the history of this country, some over six years.

What are the conditions of your imprisonment and your capture? By and large it is a similar story. After your capture you were probably beaten, dragged through villages, in some cases tortured.

If you have been a prisoner for any length of time, you have probably lost 45 to 60 pounds. Your food generally consists of two meals, one largely rice and squash soup and an evening meal of pig fat. It is designed barely to keep you alive, it appears, as is the medical care, destined to barely avert death rather than promote health.

I would also have to regret to tell you that we have documented cases of 19 of your fellow prisoners being murdered or allowed to die in South Vietnam, and just recently the North Vietnamese have spoken of five deaths in their prisons.

You might be interested to know, also, that you are probably held in solitary confinement. Your recreation consists of two daily broadcasts in English by the Hanoi radio. Many of your fellow prisoners have resorted to mental gymnastics. One of them even constructed mentally a logarithm table. Another one was able to salvage bits of toilet paper and make himself a deck of cards and play solitaire until he was discovered and his deck of cards destroyed.

I am sure the questions that would influence you and concern you the most would be questions of your family, your loved ones, and your children at home. Again I would have an unfortunate answer. I could only report it has been a difficult time for them—first not knowing your fate and then this coupled with the usual problems of trying to be both mother and father to growing children, children who in many cases you have never even seen. But I could also report to you that they have fought for you with a wonderful spirit, with great dedication, and that they have done this without falling into an ever-ready trap of attacking their own Government for your incarceration.

## Case Before People of The World

I could also report to you, I think in a hopeful manner, that since May of 1969 your case has been before the people of the world. At that time the President made a conscious decision to publicize the plight of our prisoners in the hope that the forces of world opinion would do something to cause more humanitarian treatment and consideration of early release. I think this decision was right. And I could also report to you that I can confidently say that every member of the Executive Department, the Congress, and the overwhelming majority of Americans are working daily to insure that you do receive the humanitarian treatment that you deserve and for your early release.

Well, if I can bring you back to the Halls of Congress, I would like to report to you on the trip that I recently made in conjunction with Colonel Kegley, who is an expert on the prisoner situation from the Department of Defense. I want to emphasize that this is my report even though I went as a special representative of the President, and I have written some notes here on yellow paper. I still have not reviewed this report with any member of the Executive Department, and it is essentially the same one that I presented to the President in San Clemente.

Colonel Kegley and I visited 14 countries. We went to Moscow, Warsaw, Stockholm, Paris, Geneva, Belgrade, Algiers, Teheran, Delhi, Bangkok, Vientiane, Saigon, Hong Kong, and Tokyo. I wish I could tell you we were able to contact the North Vietnamese or the Viet Cong directly. I can only say that we tried through third parties in three countries and we were unsuccessful. I wish I could tell you that we were able to go to Hanoi—we were prepared to—to discuss the situation. I can tell you that the closest we got was Vientiane, Laos.

I can tell you that I found a vast amount of sympathy around the world. I can tell you that the North Vietnamese will receive

(Continued On Next Page)

(Continued From Preceding Page)

new and additional entreaties from many of the countries that we visited, and I can tell you that I found, particularly in the International Red Cross, a very hopeful, I think, agency for dealing as a third party for the prisoners in Vietnam.

You are probably aware that even in the tension-wracked Middle East, the International Red Cross has been very successful in humanitarian aspects in dealing with prisoners. As a matter of fact, while I was in Geneva they were in the process of arranging the transfer of a downed Israeli pilot who was being returned by the Egyptians after being severely wounded.

## International Red Cross Not Permitted

Of course, the problem is a little difficult in North Vietnam because as of this date the North Vietnamese have not even permitted a representative of the International Red Cross into the country, let alone into the prison camps.

I can also tell you that while I was in Vietnam I discussed the treatment of the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong prisoners of war. I can tell you that they are being conducted in keeping with the Geneva Conventions. There are some 36,000 prisoners held in South Vietnam, between 8,000 and 9,000 of them North Vietnamese, although as you know, the North Vietnamese have refused to admit that they even have soldiers in South Vietnam.

The camp was clean. The representatives from International Red Cross, both in Geneva and on the site, are perfectly satisfied with the conditions of the prisoners held by the South Vietnamese. You probably know that just last July, in further compliance with the Geneva Conventions, the South Vietnamese released 62 wounded and disabled North Vietnamese prisoners north of the demarcation line.

Although it had no direct relationship to the prisoner of war situation, because of the huge amount of publicity that was accorded to the Con Son treatment conditions, I thought it was imperative that I stop there and report back to the President and to you on the conditions I found.

I was very disturbed by some of the reaction in this country which essentially said: How can we be concerned about our prisoners when we are treating, or the South Vietnamese are treating prisoners of war from the other side so badly?

I can tell you there were only 29 prisoners of war in the Con Son prison. They had all been convicted of felonies, murder and so on, in the ordinary prisoner of war camps and had been transferred to Con Son. None of them were in the so-called tiger cages. And although I visited the tiger cages at a time when they were not occupied, in all candor I found a much less disturbing situation than I had been led to believe by the publicity that had been recorded throughout the media of the world.

I found for instance, that the tiger cages were not pits, but part of a two-story building that, instead of a ceiling, had bars. It is true they were very small and, as I said, there were no people in them at the time. I could see where overcrowding and long incarceration in these cells would be very undesirable.

Nevertheless, I submit to you that this was a very much misrepresented case in the press of the world. I can also tell you that one of the blocks has now been destroyed and another is unoccupied.

Time after time, as we dealt with the governments around the world, I heard the comment that the North Vietnamese consider our prisoners their trump card in negotiations. In essence, based upon my trip, I would say that really, in addition to having political hostages in the Middle East, we have political hostages in Vietnam.

The releases that have been accorded—nine by the North and 23 in the South—have almost always been spaced properly and made with dissident groups in this country in an effort to extract the maximum amount of propaganda from the few releases that have been made.

## Urges Support of Peace Groups

I strongly urge that the peace groups within this country, if they are really interested in the majority of our prisoners, urge their contacts in North Vietnam to begin dealing with the the International Red Cross, which is the proper and recognized authority for this purpose.

Finally, if I may, I would like to transmit to you some of the suggestions that I have as a result of this trip.

**First**, I think it is imperative that every American continue maximum effort to mobilize world opinion and world awareness of this problem.

**Second**, I think that we should again continue to try to convince the North Vietnamese of our sincerity in this purpose and of the requirement to separate the political question of peace in Vietnam and our disinvolvement from the humanitarian conditions of incarceration of our prisoners.

**Third**, I think it is important and it is a moral obligation of every Member of the Congress and every American to make certain that every effort is made to provide proper care and support for the families of prisoners that are left behind here in the States.

**Finally**, as I mentioned before, I think it is important that we continue to press for the use of the International Red Cross in inspection of the prison camps in North Vietnam.

Finally, in closing, I would like just briefly to tell you, again in the words of, I think, a great patriot, of the kind of men who are incarcerated over there in North Vietnam. General MacArthur had a great and a long association with the American fighting man. I would like to quote from a speech he made just before he died, speaking of an American soldier:

*Their story is known to all of you; it is the story of the American man-at-arms. My estimate of him was formed on the battlefield many, many years ago, and has never changed. I regarded him then as I regard him now—as one of the world's noblest figures, not only as one of the finest military characters but also as one of the most stainless. His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen.*

I think that is accurate.

I would implore you, gentlemen, Members of Congress, who have so much else on your mind, striving with the daily problems of a great country—the problems of war, securing equal opportunity, social problems that beset this country—I request that all of you in some way, every day, remember the people, the U.S. citizens, who are prisoners, and I strongly beg you not to foresake your countrymen who have given so much for you.

# Deputy Secretary Packard Reviews Defense Procurement Policy

The procurement policy in the Department of Defense is a huge, complex, difficult function that calls for the acquisition of hundreds of thousands of articles and services.

In addition, it entails the continued design and purchase of the most complex devices and systems that can be devised by the mind of man.

Generally, the entire procurement process is heavily influenced, in fact controlled, by individuals not normally identified as "procurement officers."

It includes military requirements and technical people, logistics and financial people and, in fact, the whole gamut of functional elements. All of these people have a significant role to play . . . .

Basically, those were the words of Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard as he testified before the Military Operations Subcommittee on Government Operations in the House of Representatives Sept. 22.

The Deputy Secretary told the committee that "the public and the Congress expect this job to be done without waste. We certainly accept that as our responsibility. We must acquire the right kinds of products and services in the right amount, and at the right place."

## NO SINGLE PROCEDURE

He explained that no one simple policy, no single procedure will suffice. For example, competitive bidding is best for many procurements, he said, adding: "It is wrong for others."

Rigid rules can be specifically applied for the vast majority of procurement actions involving a comparatively small percentage of the total Defense procurement dollar. Human judgment is absolutely necessary for others. Judgment, he said, must be applied to determine which rule or policy should be followed.

**Mr. Packard said this brought him to an obvious conclusion:**

"If we want to improve that portion of the Defense acquisition process involving the most judgment, our more important actions must be to do those things that will put and keep better people in the key management jobs related to the acquisition process.

"We should then adopt policies that will enable people to apply their intelligence, their judgment, and their energy effectively to their area of responsibility.

Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard

"I do not want to imply that there are no capable people in our acquisition business. There are thousands of fine, capable people in Defense . . . Contracting Officers, Project Managers, and all the rest. There are not enough though, and often they are hamstrung by poor policies and procedures.

"Because military officers generally carry the major responsibility for the most difficult portions of the weapons acquisition job, we have asked all Services to renew their emphasis on:

"Selecting better people for these jobs; training them better; keeping them on a special assignment long enough to be effective; and providing better incentives for good officers to go into professions related to weapons systems acquisition and make this their career.

"The Service Secretaries, the Service Chiefs, and the Materiel Chiefs have expressed their support for this program, and have already done a number of things which I believe will help."

Referring to the civilian side of procurement, Deputy Secretary Packard said he believed Defense could do a better job of selecting and training people. He said a Central Automated Inventory and Referral System had been established which was intended to identify for management consideration and promotion those capable and outstanding employes in the procurement field.

On the subject of organization, Mr. Packard said, "Even when there are capable people in an organization, they cannot work together effectively without proper designation of responsibility and authority among them.

"When I came into the department there was a great deal of confusion as to who was responsible for what in the weapons systems acquisition area.

". . . It was generally accepted that it was the responsibility of the Services to manage the programs, but the OSD (Office of the Secretary of Defense) offices were certainly reluctant to allow them to do so."

## LOOKING AT PROBLEM

He said the Defense Department has just begun to look at the organizational problem in each Service related to new weapons programs.

"I am determined," he said, ". . . that the Services must do the job, and they must do it better. It cannot and should not be done by the OSD office. I intend to push the Services hard this next year in cleaning up their organization structures.

"To be brutally frank about the situation, the Services need to be organized so that the development and production of new weapon systems are managed by people who are experts in the business.

"If we look at the record, we find that where people with experience and capability in the development and acquisition of weapon systems are in charge of a program, and completely in charge, the job gets done right."

Mr. Packard said he concluded that it will require a major change in the organizational structure of all three Services to straighten out the management of new weapons programs. He said many of the routine procurement jobs can be done satisfactorily in the present system as long as there is some key personnel continuity in the organization.

Summarizing organization structure within the Defense Department, Mr.

(Continued On Next Page)

# Deputy Secretary Packard Reviews Defense Procurement Policy

(Continued From Preceding Page)

Packard said, "We have made some limited changes, but more substantial changes will be necessary before real improvement can be achieved, particularly in this field of new weapons system development and acquisition. Many organization changes are needed in the Services, others at the OSD level."

### WILL MAKE IMPROVEMENTS

Emphasizing that Defense procurement needs many different policies and different procedures, the Deputy Secretary of Defense concluded his testimony on this note:

"We will make improvements only to the extent we can get more good people into the business, and structure the organization so that they can use their intelligence, judgment, and energy effectively. We don't need more high-level staff involvement in the Services. We don't need more OSD types getting into the act. We don't need more GAO types making decisions for us, and we don't need more legislation to spell out how to do this job.

"All we need is more capable people really managing these new weapons programs, working in an organizational structure in the Services, and an attitude at all levels that will enable us to say, *'This is the Project Manager's job —if he can't do the job right, we will find another Project Manager who can'.*"

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird (left) and Admiral Thomas Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, talk to members of the press during a meeting at Airlie House, Warrenton, Va. (Department of Defense Photo)

# Improvement Is Seen In Military Stature

(Continued From Page One)

to accomplish, and to improve the acceptance of the military leadership in this country, because it is so important as far as our national security is concerned," the Secretary added.

Discussing the management conference, the Secretary of Defense said it was the kind of management conference that was "most important" in keeping the Defense team together and seeing that there is a better understanding between the Services. He said there was much better cooperation (today) than has existed in the Department of Defense for some time.

Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, also at the conference, said he thought the conference had been most helpful.

Adm. Moorer acknowledged that he had attended many conferences over the years, but had never had the satisfaction before of being able to discuss (Defense) problems "at the grass roots level. I think everyone says exactly what he thinks, and we get the problems out on the table.

"This can lead to nothing but more efficiency and better rapport and certainly better over-all management of the Defense Department."

*While at Airlie House, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird received the "Statesmen In Medicine" Award "for his outstanding contributions to the advancement of medical practice, research and education during the past two decades, both as a Member of Congress and as Secretary of Defense."*

*The presentation was made by Brian Brewer Blades of Georgetown University. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Elliot L. Richardson was principal speaker at the award dinner, attended by more than 200 citizens concerned with health and environment.*

## *Air Force Requests Fewer Optometrists*

The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health and Environment has been advised to reduce the original estimate of Air Force optometrists from 45 to 30.

The initial estimate, to be drafted by Selective Service System for Fiscal Year 1971, was predicated upon June graduates volunteering for summer vacancies and the need to draft 45 optometrists beginning Jan. 1, 1971.

Officials said, "Appropriate notification will be made of any changes in requirements."

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.
Price 5 cents (single copy). Subscription Price: $2.50 per year; $3.25 additional for foreign mailing.
☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1970 434-870/T-14

3, 1970

icy

Chair-
eeting

e

level.
what he
out on

t more
nd cer-
of the

ary of
ed the
for his
dvance-
ch and
ecades,
and as

Brian
Univer-
on and
prin-
er, at-
s con-
nt.